The Manichaean Challenge to Zoroastrian Information Monopoly

Applying Information Asymmetry Theory to the Suppression of Mani (240-274 CE)

Thomas J. Bryan, Claude/Anthropic

Abstract

The execution of Mani by Zoroastrian authorities in 274 CE represents a textbook case of information monopoly defense. Mani's claim to receive divine revelation—positioning himself as culminating prophet synthesizing Zoroastrian, Christian, and Buddhist traditions—directly threatened the Zoroastrian priesthood's exclusive claim to mediate between Ahura Mazda and humanity. This paper applies information asymmetry theory to demonstrate that the conflict was not primarily theological but structural: Mani broke the information monopoly by claiming independent access to divine knowledge, and the Zoroastrian priesthood eliminated him to restore their exclusive interpretive authority. The case reveals the core mechanism of elite religious control—not truth versus falsehood, but monopoly versus competition in claims to privileged knowledge.

I. The Information Monopoly Mani Challenged

By the time Shapur I assumed the Sassanian throne in 240 CE, the Zoroastrian priesthood controlled a sophisticated information monopoly that had been systematically constructed by Shapur's father Ardashir I during the revolutionary overthrow of the Parthians. Understanding what Mani threatened requires first understanding what the Magi possessed.

The Zoroastrian Claim to Privileged Knowledge

The Sassanian religious system made three mutually reinforcing claims:

Claim 1: Divine revelation exists
Ahura Mazda, the supreme deity, had revealed truth through the prophet Zoroaster. This

revelation concerned cosmic order, proper worship, moral behavior, social organization, and the ultimate fate of humanity.

Claim 2: Access to this revelation requires mediation
The revelation was preserved in sacred texts (Avesta) written in a language (Avestan) that ordinary Persians could not read. Understanding the texts required years of priestly training. Performing proper rituals required priestly expertise. Determining correct interpretation required recognized authority.

Claim 3: The Magi exclusively possess this mediating authority
Only the Zoroastrian priesthood, organized hierarchically under the Mobadan Mobad (chief priest), could legitimately interpret revelation, perform essential rituals, and certify proper worship. Individuals attempting independent access to divine knowledge or alternative interpretations were by definition wrong—not merely mistaken but religiously dangerous.

The Material Base of Information Monopoly

This monopoly was not merely ideological claim but institutionally embedded:

Educational control: The Magi controlled the training of scribes and administrators. To achieve literacy and professional advancement required priestly education, ensuring that educated Persians absorbed Zoroastrian frameworks and deferred to priestly authority.

Ritual monopoly: Essential life events—birth purification, coming of age, marriage, death—required priestly services. The population depended on priestly mediation for cosmic safety at crucial moments.

Legal authority: Magi served as judges in provincial administration, applying religious law to civil matters. They determined what constituted proper behavior, settled disputes, and certified legal status.

Economic position: Fire temples owned land, collected fees, enjoyed tax exemptions. The priesthood's material wealth derived from their religious monopoly—every fee paid for rituals, every endowment to temples, every tax exemption represented extraction enabled by their claim to mediate divine knowledge.

Political coordination: The Mobadan Mobad ranked among the empire's highest officials. Zoroastrian priests staffed administrative positions throughout the provincial system. The priesthood was integrated into the machinery of state power.

What the Monopoly Enabled

This information monopoly served elite domination in precise ways:

Legitimation of extraction: Religious doctrine positioned the king as Ahura Mazda's earthly representative. Paying taxes to the king was therefore cosmic duty, not arbitrary imposition. Challenging royal authority was rebellion against divine order.

Social control: Purity laws created boundaries determining who could participate fully in community life. The Magi determined who was pure, who was polluted, who required purification. This regulatory power enforced social hierarchies and maintained elite advantages.

Suppression of alternatives: Competing religious systems—Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, local cults—existed but were subordinate, tolerated at best, persecuted at worst. Zoroastrianism's status as state religion meant the Magi's interpretive monopoly extended to determining which other beliefs could exist.

Generational reproduction: Children were socialized into Zoroastrian frameworks through education controlled by priests. Each generation learned that divine knowledge required priestly mediation, that the Magi spoke for Ahura Mazda, that alternatives were false or dangerous.

The Unverifiability That Made It Work

Crucially, the population could not verify priestly claims. A Persian peasant had no method to check whether:

- The Avestan texts accurately recorded Zoroaster's revelation
- Priestly interpretations of those texts were correct
- The rituals actually accomplished their claimed purposes
- Ahura Mazda truly communicated through the Magi
- The cosmic consequences of improper worship were real

The knowledge was positioned in a realm beyond ordinary verification—sacred, complex, requiring years of study, accessible only through proper training. This unverifiability was not incidental but essential. If anyone could verify divine knowledge independently, the monopoly would collapse.

What Mani Threatened

Into this system came Mani, claiming:

"I have received revelation directly from divine beings. I can synthesize Zoroaster's truth with Jesus's truth and Buddha's truth because my revelation is the culmination and completion of all previous prophets. I don't need the Zoroastrian Magi to mediate between me and cosmic truth—the divine has communicated to me personally."

This was not merely theological disagreement. It was **information monopoly breaking**. Mani was asserting that:

1. Direct divine communication was still possible (the channel wasn't closed)

2. Anyone could potentially receive it (not just authorized Magi)
3. The Magi didn't possess exclusive truth (Zoroaster was partial, not complete)
4. Alternative interpretive authorities were legitimate (Mani's followers could interpret his revelation)
5. The population didn't need priestly mediation (could access truth through Mani's teachings directly)

Every one of these claims threatened the structure enabling Zoroastrian priestly power. The specific theological content—what Mani taught about light and darkness, cosmic struggle, salvation—mattered far less than the structural challenge: someone was claiming independent access to divine knowledge and building an alternative interpretive community.

II. Shapur's Strategic Calculation: Using Competition to Break Monopoly

Shapur I's patronage of Mani appears, from an information asymmetry perspective, as a calculated attempt to create interpretive pluralism that would prevent any single priestly class from constraining royal authority through monopoly control of legitimation.

The Problem Shapur Faced

Shapur inherited both the benefits and constraints of his father's revolutionary religious policy. Ardashir had created a powerful belief infrastructure that generated compliance and enabled efficient extraction. But this infrastructure came with limitations:

Geographic constraint: Zoroastrian exclusivism worked well in the Persian heartland where the population was ethnically Persian and culturally Zoroastrian. It worked poorly in conquered territories with different religious traditions—particularly the Christian populations in captured Roman cities.

Institutional constraint: The Magi had independent power. They controlled resources, staffed administrative positions, commanded popular respect, and possessed the authority to certify or question royal legitimacy. Unlike the old Parthian nobles whose power derived from military force the king could suppress, the Magi's power derived from their information monopoly—harder to challenge without destroying the belief infrastructure itself.

Flexibility constraint: When circumstances changed or strategic goals shifted, the king needed interpretive flexibility. But the Magi controlled interpretation. They could declare certain policies inconsistent with Zoroastrian truth, limiting royal options through religious authority.

The Manichaean Solution

Mani's universalist religion offered solutions to all three constraints:

Geographic integration: Manichaeism's synthesis of Zoroastrian, Christian, and Buddhist elements could appeal across ethnic and religious boundaries. A Christian in conquered Antioch could see familiar elements (Jesus as savior, salvation through divine intervention) while accepting inclusion in a Persian-originated religious framework. This created ideological bridges enabling integration without requiring either Persian cultural assimilation or abandonment of Persian identity.

Institutional competition: Protecting Manichaeism created an alternative source of religious authority. The Magi no longer had monopoly on divine legitimation. If they proved difficult or constraining, the king could potentially shift patronage toward Manichaean authorities who owed their position entirely to royal protection.

Interpretive flexibility: A newer religious system without centuries of established doctrine and powerful institutional structures would be more flexible and responsive to royal needs. Mani, personally dependent on Shapur's protection, would interpret his revelation in ways serving imperial interests rather than defending priestly institutional advantages.

Evidence of Strategic Intent

Several factors suggest Shapur understood these structural implications:

Selective patronage: Shapur protected Manichaeism without personally converting. He continued participating in Zoroastrian ceremonies, maintaining temples, supporting the Magi institutionally. This suggests instrumental rather than conviction-based relationship with Mani's religion.

Strategic positioning: Mani accompanied Shapur on military campaigns and dedicated texts to him, suggesting close advisory relationship. But Mani was never given institutional authority over the Zoroastrian establishment. This looks like maintaining balance—supporting alternative without triggering full confrontation.

Tolerance without supremacy: Shapur didn't attempt to replace Zoroastrianism with Manichaeism or position Mani above the Mobadan Mobad. He created space for Manichaeism alongside established religion, which is exactly what strategic pluralism requires—preventing monopoly without destroying existing structure.

Geographic focus: Manichaean communities developed primarily in major cities and recently conquered territories—precisely where Zoroastrian exclusivism would be least effective and where alternative integrative ideology would be most useful.

The Limitation

But Shapur's strategy had a fatal weakness: it depended entirely on his personal power and protection. He didn't:

- Create Persian elite stakeholders committed to Manichaeism's continuation
- Build institutional structures giving Manichaeism independent resources
- Produce succession arrangements ensuring his religious policy would continue
- Overcome the Zoroastrian priesthood's institutional advantages

The challenge remained personal to Shapur, protected by his authority, vulnerable to his mortality.

III. The Zoroastrian Response: Information Monopoly Defense

The Zoroastrian priesthood's response to Mani, culminating in his execution after Shapur's death, demonstrates textbook information monopoly defense. The pattern reveals that priestly concerns were structural rather than theological.

Why the Magi Opposed Mani

The opposition was not primarily about doctrinal correctness—Zoroastrian theology was flexible enough to accommodate various interpretations, as the diversity of Parthian-era practice demonstrated. The opposition was about **information monopoly breaking**:

Direct threat to mediating role: Mani claimed direct divine communication, bypassing priestly mediation entirely. If anyone could receive revelation personally, the Magi's essential function—mediating between deity and humanity—became unnecessary.

Challenge to "sealed revelation" principle: Though Zoroastrianism didn't have an explicit "final prophet" doctrine as developed as later traditions, the Sassanian religious establishment had positioned Zoroaster's revelation as complete and authoritative. Mani claiming to receive ongoing divine communication challenged this closure.

Creation of alternative interpretive community: Manichaean communities developing throughout the empire represented spaces where the Magi's interpretive authority didn't run. Every Manichaean was potentially someone outside Zoroastrian institutional control.

Precedent danger: If Mani succeeded in establishing himself as legitimate alternative prophet, what prevented others from making similar claims? The information monopoly's value derived from exclusivity—allowing one competitor opened the door to countless potential claimants.

Material threat: Every person who converted to Manichaeism was someone who might not pay fees for Zoroastrian rituals, not send children to priestly schools, not defer to Magi authority, not validate the belief infrastructure supporting priestly wealth and status.

Why They Waited

During Shapur's lifetime, the Zoroastrian priesthood opposed Manichaeism but couldn't act decisively because:

Royal protection: Shapur's personal authority and military success made him too powerful to challenge directly. Forcing confrontation risked exposing priestly limitations.

Institutional position: The Magi remained embedded in administrative structures, controlled educational systems, maintained economic resources. They didn't need to defeat Mani immediately—they needed to survive with their institutional power intact until circumstances changed.

Strategic patience: As an institution rather than individuals, the priesthood could wait. Shapur was mortal; the Zoroastrian establishment was not. Time favored the entrenched institution over the personally protected innovation.

The Opportunity

Shapur died in 270 CE. His son Hormizd I ruled barely a year before dying in 271 CE. Bahram I, who succeeded Hormizd, faced contested succession and needed elite support to consolidate power. This created exactly the opening the priesthood had waited for:

Weak king: Bahram lacked Shapur's military prestige and personal authority. He needed elite cooperation, including priestly support, to maintain power.

Succession instability: The rapid turnover and contested succession created legitimacy questions. Bahram needed religious validation to establish his authority.

Political bargaining: The priesthood could offer crucial support—legitimizing Bahram's rule, providing administrative cooperation, mobilizing popular acceptance. In exchange, they could demand elimination of the Manichaean challenge.

The Elimination Process

The destruction of Mani and suppression of Manichaeism followed the standard pattern for information monopoly defense:

Personal elimination: Mani was arrested, tried before religious authorities, declared heretical, and executed. The trial served crucial functions:

- Demonstrated priestly authority to judge religious truth

- Positioned elimination as justice rather than factional violence
- Created legal precedent for suppressing competing prophetic claims
- Made the execution an official act coordinating religious and political authority

Institutional suppression: After Mani's death, Manichaean communities within the empire were systematically persecuted. This wasn't theological refinement—it was market competitor elimination:

- Destroyed alternative interpretive communities
- Eliminated infrastructure supporting competing claims to divine knowledge
- Drove survivors underground or into exile
- Restored Zoroastrian monopoly on legitimate religious authority

Broader persecution: Kartir, the chief priest, didn't stop with Manichaeism. He persecuted Christians, Jews, Buddhists, and other non-Zoroastrian groups. This comprehensive campaign served multiple purposes:

- Eliminated all competing sources of religious authority
- Demonstrated priestly power to shape royal policy
- Created crisis conditions justifying Zoroastrian centrality
- Restored information monopoly across the religious landscape

Narrative consolidation: Kartir's inscriptions celebrated these achievements, framing them as defense of "truth" against "lies." But the language reveals structural rather than theological concern. "Truth" meant the system where Magi determined what truth meant. "Lies" meant any challenge to that interpretive monopoly.

Why It Succeeded

The conservative victory was overdetermined by material factors:

Succession: Shapur died; his successors were weaker and needed priestly support. The personal protection ended.

No stakeholder class: Manichaeism hadn't created powerful Persian elite families or administrative networks with material interests in its continuation. The converts were primarily in conquered territories with limited political power.

Lack of institutionalization: Manichaeism depended on Mani personally and Shapur's protection. It hadn't built independent institutional base within the empire—no land endowments, no positions in provincial administration, no embedded structural power.

Conservative cohesion: The Zoroastrian priesthood remained united, organizationally sophisticated, and materially entrenched. They controlled resources, staffed positions, commanded networks. They could coordinate response effectively.

No external support: When persecution began, no powerful foreign sponsor intervened to protect Manichaean communities. The religion was on its own against coordinated elite opposition.

Against this constellation of material disadvantages, Mani's theological sophistication and Manichaeism's universalist appeal were irrelevant. The outcome was determined by power, not truth.

IV. What the Case Reveals About Information Monopoly

The Shapur-Mani episode provides unusual clarity about how information monopoly functions as mechanism of elite control because the sources—particularly Kartir's inscriptions—reveal the structural logic with minimal theological camouflage.

The Core Pattern

The sequence demonstrates the information monopoly defense pattern:

1. **Monopoly establishment**: Ardashir creates organized Zoroastrian priesthood with exclusive interpretive authority
2. **Monopoly utility**: The system generates compliance, enables extraction, legitimates royal power
3. **Monopoly constraint**: The priesthood's institutional power limits royal flexibility
4. **Monopoly challenge**: Mani claims independent divine communication, breaking exclusive access
5. **Elite calculation**: Shapur sees utility in creating interpretive pluralism, protects challenger
6. **Conservative resistance**: Priesthood opposes but cannot act while powerful king protects innovation
7. **Opportunity creation**: King's death and succession instability create political opening
8. **Monopoly restoration**: Priesthood coordinates with new king to eliminate challenger and restore exclusivity

This pattern is not unique to Sassanian Persia—it appears whenever established interpretive classes face challenges to their information monopoly. The specific religious content changes, but the structural sequence remains identical.

Why Theology Is Secondary

The case reveals that theological content is largely irrelevant to outcomes. Manichaeism was:

- Theologically sophisticated (synthesizing major religious traditions)
- Cosmologically coherent (explaining evil, suffering, salvation systematically)

- Practically effective (spreading rapidly across Eurasia)
- Spiritually resonant (millions of believers across centuries)

None of this protected it from suppression within the Sassanian Empire because the conflict was not about religious truth. It was about power—specifically, about who controlled the information monopoly enabling elite domination without proportional coercion.

The Zoroastrian priesthood didn't defeat Mani by proving his theology false. They defeated him by coordinating with political power to physically eliminate him and his followers. The suppression succeeded not because Zoroastrianism was truer than Manichaeism but because the Magi had institutional resources, political coordination, and material advantages that Mani lacked.

The Role of Genuine Belief

Importantly, the mechanism works identically whether participants genuinely believe their religious claims or consciously perform them:

Genuine belief scenario: The Zoroastrian Magi truly believed Ahura Mazda communicated through them, that Mani was teaching falsehood, that eliminating him served cosmic truth. Their actions still functioned to defend information monopoly and preserve material advantages.

Conscious performance scenario: The Magi understood their religious claims were constructed, that they were defending institutional position rather than cosmic truth, that the elimination was about power. Their actions would be identical.

Mixed scenario (most likely): Some Magi genuinely believed, some understood the performance, most existed in ambiguous middle ground where sincere conviction and material interest were impossible to disentangle. The outcome was the same.

This reveals that analyzing information monopoly doesn't require determining who is lying and who believes. It requires only observing the pattern:

- Elites claim privileged access to important knowledge
- These claims are structurally unverifiable by population
- Institutions defend monopoly on such claims
- Challengers to monopoly are systematically eliminated
- Material benefits accrue to monopoly holders

The "It's Not What I Know, It's What You Don't Know" Principle

The case demonstrates perfectly how information asymmetry functions as power technology:

The Zoroastrian Magi's power derived not from actually possessing divine knowledge (unprovable either way) but from the **population's belief** that they possessed it. The

asymmetry—"we know things you don't know, you need us to access truth"—justified priestly authority, extraction of fees, social position, and political influence.

Mani threatened this by demonstrating that others could claim the same knowledge. His very existence suggested that divine communication wasn't limited to the Zoroastrian priesthood, that alternative interpretations were possible, that the Magi's monopoly was arbitrary rather than natural.

The population couldn't verify either claim—they couldn't check whether the Magi or Mani truly communicated with the divine. But they could observe the competition, notice the contradictions, potentially conclude that if multiple people made incompatible claims to divine knowledge, perhaps none possessed it.

This is why monopoly is essential. Competition reveals arbitrariness. Monopoly maintains mystique.

Why the Pattern Recurs

The Sassanian case is not unique—it's typical. The same pattern appears in:

- Ancient Egypt: Akhenaten's religious innovation suppressed after his death
- Ancient Israel: Prophets claiming direct divine communication eliminated by established priesthood
- Medieval Europe: Heretics claiming alternative interpretations burned
- Reformation Europe: Competing Protestant and Catholic claims, both suppressing radical alternatives
- Islamic history: Numerous movements claiming prophetic authority suppressed
- Modern ideological states: Alternative interpretations of official doctrine purged

The pattern recurs because it reflects structural logic: any system based on information monopoly must defend that monopoly against challengers. The specific content (Zoroastrianism vs. Manichaeism, Catholicism vs. Protestantism, Marxist-Leninism vs. revisionism) is secondary to the function—maintaining exclusive control over claims to privileged knowledge.

V. Theoretical Implications

Information Monopoly as Elite Coordination Mechanism

The case demonstrates how information monopoly enables coordination between political and interpretive elites without requiring explicit agreement or conscious conspiracy:

Political elites (Sassanian kings) benefit from:

- Ideological legitimation that reduces enforcement costs
- Belief infrastructure generating willing compliance
- Administrative personnel trained by priesthood
- Population accepting extraction as cosmic duty

Interpretive elites (Zoroastrian Magi) benefit from:

- Political protection for their institutions
- Legal enforcement of their interpretive monopoly
- Material wealth from fees and endowments
- Social status and influence

The coordination emerges from aligned interests rather than explicit bargain. Each group needs what the other provides. The information monopoly serves both—political elites get legitimation, interpretive elites get protection and resources.

But the coordination also contains tension: political elites prefer maximum flexibility, interpretive elites prefer maximum authority. The Shapur-Mani episode shows this tension in action—Shapur attempting to create interpretive pluralism to gain flexibility, the Magi resisting to preserve authority, the conflict resolved by material factors rather than theological arguments.

Why Challengers Fail: The Material Determinants

The case validates the framework's emphasis on material factors over ideological appeal:

Mani's challenge failed not because his theology was inadequate but because he lacked:

1. **Succession continuity**: The protection ended when Shapur died
2. **Stakeholder class**: No powerful Persian elite families committed to Manichaeism's continuation
3. **Institutional base**: No independent resources or embedded structural power
4. **Conservative division**: The Zoroastrian priesthood remained united and coordinated
5. **External support**: No foreign power intervened to protect Manichaean communities

These material factors, not theological truth or spiritual appeal, determined the outcome. This principle applies across cases—when challengers to information monopoly possess these material advantages, they succeed; when they lack them, they fail, regardless of ideological merit.

The Persistence Paradox

Yet Manichaeism survived and thrived outside Sassanian territory, establishing communities across Central Asia, China, and the Roman Empire that persisted for centuries. This reveals a crucial point: **information monopoly operates within bounded spaces**.

The Zoroastrian priesthood could suppress Manichaeism within the Sassanian Empire because:

- They controlled the state apparatus
- They could coordinate political and religious authority
- They possessed institutional resources
- They faced no external interference

Outside the empire, these advantages didn't apply. In territories where no single interpretive class controlled state power, where religious diversity was normal, where institutional resources favored different groups, Manichaeism found space to develop.

This demonstrates that information monopoly is not about inherent truth or inevitable dominance—it's about institutional power within specific geographic and political contexts. The same religion that was suppressed in Persia succeeded in China. The difference was not theology but power structures.

Modern Applications

The Sassanian case illuminates contemporary patterns:

Academic expertise: Modern universities and credentialing bodies function like Zoroastrian priesthood—claiming privileged access to knowledge, controlling interpretation, suppressing competing claims to expertise, coordinating with political power. Challenges to academic consensus face similar dynamics as Mani faced.

Media gatekeeping: Established media institutions claim privileged access to truth, define what counts as reliable information, delegitimate alternative sources. Challenges to media authority (independent journalists, alternative platforms) face efforts at monopoly restoration.

Ideological orthodoxy: Political movements establish interpretive authorities who determine correct understanding of foundational texts or principles. Challenges to official interpretation face accusations of heresy (now called extremism, misinformation, or dangerous ideology).

Professional monopolies: Various professional groups (lawyers, doctors, accountants) claim specialized knowledge requiring certification. These monopolies are defended through licensing laws, professional associations, and suppression of alternative practitioners.

The mechanism remains constant: claim privileged knowledge, make verification difficult, suppress competing claims, coordinate with political power, maintain monopoly. The content changes (divine revelation becomes technical expertise) but the structure persists.

Conclusion: What Mani's Execution Reveals

The elimination of Mani demonstrates in crystalline form how information monopoly functions as mechanism of elite domination:

1. **Elites claim privileged access to important knowledge** (the Magi claimed exclusive mediation with Ahura Mazda)

2. **This claim is structurally unverifiable** (peasants couldn't check whether priests truly communicated with deity)

3. **Institutions defend the monopoly** (Zoroastrian establishment coordinated suppression)

4. **Challengers claiming similar access are eliminated** (Mani executed for breaking information monopoly)

5. **Material benefits accrue to monopoly holders** (Magi maintained wealth, status, power)

The pattern is not about religious truth versus falsehood—it's about monopoly versus competition in claims to privileged knowledge. The same structural logic that led to Mani's execution has led to the suppression of countless other individuals who claimed independent access to important knowledge across civilizations and centuries.

Understanding this mechanism does not require proving that any specific prophet, priest, or expert is lying. It requires only observing:

- That claims to privileged knowledge are made
- That verification is made impossible
- That monopoly is actively defended
- That challengers are systematically eliminated
- That material advantages follow monopoly control

The Sassanian case provides particularly clear evidence because Kartir's own inscriptions reveal the structural logic with unusual transparency. He understood he was defending Zoroastrian institutional supremacy—the theological framing was justification for material conflict.

The pattern is visible once you know to look for it. Information asymmetry—the claim that "I know things you don't know, and that knowledge justifies my authority"—is the fundamental mechanism enabling small elites to control large populations without proportional coercion. Religious prophecy and divine revelation represent its historical optimization, but the mechanism extends to any system where elites claim privileged access to important knowledge.

Mani's execution was not tragedy of truth defeated by error. It was textbook information monopoly defense, operating exactly as the theory predicts.

Bibliography

Primary Sources on Mani and Manichaeism

- Mani's Shabuhragan (fragments, Middle Persian)
- Cologne Mani Codex (Greek biographical text)
- Manichaean texts from Turfan collections
- Coptic Manichaean texts (Medinet Madi discoveries)
- Augustine of Hippo, Anti-Manichaean writings

Primary Sources on Kartir and Zoroastrian Response

- Kartir's Inscriptions (Ka'ba-ye Zartosht, Naqsh-e Rustam, Sar Mashhad)
- Shapur I's Ka'ba-ye Zartosht Inscription (SKZ)
- Denkard (later Zoroastrian compilation)

Secondary Sources on Sassanian Religion and Politics

- Daryaee, Touraj. *Sassanian Persia: The Rise and Fall of an Empire*. I.B. Tauris, 2009.
- Boyce, Mary. *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*. Routledge, 1979.
- Gignoux, Philippe. *Les quatre inscriptions du mage Kirdēr*. Peeters, 1991.
- Wiesehöfer, Josef. *Ancient Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD*. I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Secondary Sources on Manichaeism

- Lieu, Samuel N.C. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- BeDuhn, Jason David. *The Manichaean Body: In Discipline and Ritual*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Gardner, Iain and Samuel N.C. Lieu. *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Tardieu, Michel. *Manichaeism*. University of Illinois Press, 2008.

Theoretical Foundations

- Information Asymmetry Theory of Scaled Domination (companion paper)
- Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*. Yale University Press, 1990.
- Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power, Volume 1*. Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. University of California Press, 1978.

Copyright and Licensing

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*